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PART I: INTRODUCTION

Within the overview section of this report, the role and purpose of assessment in the teacher-learning paradigm, along with key strategic documents, are presented.

WHY ASSESSMENT IS IMPORTANT

In a teaching-learning university and comprehensive research-extensive land and sea grant institution, assessment is focused on describing very explicit outcomes expected of the students and adopts reliable and valid procedures for assessing this achievement, according to the New England Association of Schools and Colleges’ policy statement on institutional effectiveness, [http://www.assessment.uconn.edu/accreditation.htm](http://www.assessment.uconn.edu/accreditation.htm).

The University of Connecticut (herein, UConn), and specifically the Neag School of Education (herein, the Neag School), embraces this paradigm shift for learning and assessment.

A key ingredient in the learner-centered environment is where the mission and conceptual framework are used as a process that focuses on the learner. Thus, the focus is on what a student learns by providing consistent, continual, and interactive feedback. The goal is to understand not only what students know, but also how they know it. Learner-centered professors coach and facilitate, intertwining teaching and assessment. In a learner-centered environment, teaching and assessment are not separate, episodic events; they are ongoing, interrelated activities focused on providing guidance for improvement (Freed & Huba, 2000). In such an environment, assessment is important for a number of reasons.

Assessment is crucial for helping people learn. Assessment should mirror good instruction, happen continuously as part of instruction, and provide information about the levels of understanding that students are reaching. For learners to gain insight into their learning and their understanding, frequent feedback is critical: students need to monitor their learning and actively evaluate their strategies and their current levels of understanding (Bransford, Brown, & Cocking, 1999).

Assessment is needed for effective teaching. According to Bain (2004), people tend to learn most effectively in ways that make a sustained, substantial, and positive influence on the way they think, act, or feel when they:

- are trying to solve problems (intellectual, physical, artistic, practical, abstract, etc.) or create something new that they find intriguing, beautiful, and/or important;

- are able to do so in a challenging yet supportive environment in which they can feel a sense of control over their own educational experiences;
• can work collaboratively with other learners to grapple with the problems;
• believe that their work will be considered fairly and honestly; and,
• can try, fail, and receive feedback from expert learners in advance of and separate from any summative judgment of their efforts.

*Assessment is needed for a quality learning environment.* Quality learning environments are learning, knowledge, assessment, and community-centered. Learner-centered is paying careful attention to the knowledge, skills, attitudes, and beliefs that learners bring to the educational setting. Knowledge-centered is taking seriously the need to help students become knowledgeable by learning in ways that lead to understanding. Assessment-centered is providing opportunities for feedback and revision whereby what is assessed is congruent with the students’ learning goals. While formative assessment involves the use of assessments as sources of feedback to improve teaching and learning, summative assessment measures what students have learned at the end of some set of learning activities. Finally, community-centered is referring to several aspects of community, including the classroom as community, the school as a community, and the degree to which students, teachers, and administrators feel connected to the larger community of homes, business, states, the nation, and even the world (Bransford, Brown, & Cocking, 1999).

**MULTIPLE PURPOSES FOR ASSESSMENTS**

Assessment serves multiple purposes. As displayed in Figure 1, the level of assessment (Who?), the purpose of assessment (Why?), and the object of assessment (What?) must be taken into account ([http://www.assessment.uconn.edu/why2.htm](http://www.assessment.uconn.edu/why2.htm)).

There are many questions that can be addressed through assessment. For student learning, how well do course objectives track with curricula objectives and, to what extent are key curricula goals introduced and reinforced from course to course? For curricula efficiency, to what extent are objectives based on documented evidence regarding what students need to know and do? For student success, what is our track record in attracting and retaining students, and how do they do after graduation?
Assessment cannot stand alone; it needs grounding in strategic and systematic processes. For example, the assessment plan needs to be grounded in the University’s and the Neag School’s missions.

The latest revision of the mission statement was adopted by the Board of Trustees in 2006. This mission statement serves as a guide as the transformation of the University of Connecticut into a major nationally-recognized comprehensive research institution continues. The mission of the University of Connecticut states:

The University of Connecticut is dedicated to excellence demonstrated through national and international recognition. As Connecticut’s public research university, through freedom of academic inquiry and expression, we create and disseminate knowledge by means of scholarly and creative achievements, graduate and professional education, and outreach. Through our focus on teaching and learning, the University helps every student grow intellectually and become a contributing member of the state, national, and world communities. Through research, teaching, service, and outreach, we embrace diversity and cultivate leadership, integrity, and engaged citizenship in our students, faculty, staff, and alumni. As our state’s flagship public university, and as a land and sea grant institution, we promote the health and well being of Connecticut’s citizens through enhancing the social, economic, cultural, and natural environments of the state and beyond (http://www.neasc.uconn.edu/std1.htm).

The mission of the University of Connecticut is guided by The Academic Plan which is:

... a set of goals and strategic steps that will advance the University’s standing in five interrelated areas: Undergraduate Education, Graduate and Professional Education, Research, Scholarship, and Creative Activity, Diversity, and, Public Engagement. In each of these five areas, the plan articulates an overarching goal, describes the relationship between that goal and the values and themes underlying the plan, and then enumerates the strategies that we will use to achieve our goals (http://academicplan.uconn.edu/files/UConnAcademicPlan.pdf).

Aligned with the University’s mission, is the Neag School of Education’s mission which is:
Develop students with strong ethical standards who become teachers and leaders dedicated to improving education for all children, and by doing so, will strive to improve and enhance the quality of life in our ever changing society (http://www.education.uconn.edu/about/mission.cfm).

The Neag School achieves its mission through leadership, scholarship, inquiry, and service, under the three principle themes of learning, leading, and lighting the way in its conceptual framework. The conceptual framework themes permeate all programs and are defined by the five strands. As stated within the conceptual framework (April, 2008),

**Theme One: Learning**

*Element One: Professional Knowledge Base*
... ensure an understanding of both the theoretical and practical dimensions of the profession, working in culturally and linguistically diverse settings...

*Element Two: Evidence-Based Professional Practice*
... ensure a deep understanding of the theoretical and practical dimensions of professional practice and integrate theory, research, and practice..., a comprehensive knowledge of professional practice includes student knowledge of, and familiarity with, relevant professional “codes of ethics,” an understanding of moral and ethical decision making, and professional behaviors in accordance with ethical norms of the profession.

**Theme Two: Leading**

*Element One: Inquiry*
... provide the opportunity to become both intelligent and informed consumers of research and producers of new knowledge, informing professional practice with evidence resulting from empirical investigations.

*Element Two: Leadership*  
(facilitate) ...leadership to effect growth and development within the student’s chosen profession in particular, and in American democracy in general.

**Theme Three: Lighting the Way**

*Element One: Inspiration and Diversity*
... inspire our candidates to become educational leaders who are capable of lighting a fire for future leaders and practitioners so that [they] are passionate about equity and human rights.
PART II: THE PLAN

The development of the Neag School of Education Assessment Plan to collect and analyze data for the purpose of understanding teaching, learning and student development is discussed in this section. Also, the system to ensure psychometric properties and how the plan is informally assessed is presented.

DEVELOPMENT OF ASSESSMENT PLAN

The assessment plan for the Neag School has its roots in 2004-2005 and was developed initially by the Teaching Certification Assessment Committee. Following individual meetings with each department leader and the Associate Dean for the Neag School, in the winter of 2006 the Director of Assessment configured the Neag Assessment Committee to consist of two or three faculty members and two students appointed by each department leader, and a cadre of individuals representing the education preparation programs appointed by the Associate Dean. During the spring of 2007, the Neag Assessment Committee started an outline for the Neag School of Education Assessment Plan and worked to accomplish objectives for the year. A thorough review of the 400+ pages of the 2004-2005 assessment plan was undertaken by this committee. The first finding was that this initial plan had a heavy emphasis on the initial teacher education programs but minimally addressed the advanced programs in school counselor education, school psychology, speech, reading, and the school administrator preparation programs. The second finding was that Kinesiology was excluded. The third finding was that much data reporting and analyses could be reserved for appendices or electronic web retrieval of data and/or reports. Therefore, the committee decided that its goal was to create a document that would succinctly articulate the assessment plan for the constituent programs across all departments and various units (e.g. NCATE) in the Neag School.

Given these three major findings, an outline of the 2nd version of the Neag Assessment Plan was developed by the committee with input from department and program leaders in the fall of 2007. To obtain feedback from a larger audience, this draft outline, and subsequent draft versions, was further discussed during the monthly department faculty meetings. In the spring of 2008, the committee finished the revision of the plan and then brought the plan to the entire Neag faculty meeting, monthly department meetings, and to clinical or field experience teachers/supervisors, alumni, and employers. The 2nd edition of the Neag School of Education Assessment Plan was distributed in September of 2008.

While the committee continued to make strides at realizing its objectives, it was during the fall of 2011-2012 that the Neag Assessment Committee developed a 3rd edition of the plan. As a result, this assessment plan was further streamlined.
Within this assessment plan, we center on the conceptual framework of the Neag School and incorporate the state and national standards that are appropriate for each program. An essential feature of the assessment plan is that it manifests differently for each program. Thus, while there is a general assessment plan for the Neag School, there are multiple assessment systems that reflect the different foci and needs of our programs. The assessment plan employs multiple measures of assessment to monitor candidate progress at various key points called “components” of their educational processes. Borrowing from NCATE, the Neag School has decided on transition points at entry, during the program (major points prior to entering clinical practice, when appropriate), immediately prior to program completion, and post-graduation follow-up for all of the programs within the Neag School. The mid-program and program completion components are considered to be most important. While it is important to note that, while embedded, each component is best addressed by the one element in the conceptual framework as displayed in Table 2.

### Table 1
**Major Assessments by Key Components**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Components</th>
<th>Types of Assessments</th>
<th>Sources of Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1. Admissions</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(also called preparation program)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demographics</td>
<td>Transcripts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GPA</td>
<td>Transcripts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAT or other test data</td>
<td>Applications</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>References</td>
<td>Reference forms</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviews, personal statements, etc.</td>
<td>Program personnel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRE or MAT (graduate only)</td>
<td>Test vendors (e.g., ETS)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2. Mid-program</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(also called preparation program)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coursework</td>
<td>Plans of study</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course grades</td>
<td>Faculty/PeopleSoft</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projects, tests etc.</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-portfolio (Teacher Ed, UCAPP)</td>
<td>TaskStream</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student evaluations</td>
<td>Institution Research</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid-cycle Evaluation</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3. Program completion</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(also called clinical, student teacher, internship, practicum experiences)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applications</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Test Scores (Praxis II)</td>
<td>ETS/Student/As. Office</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-Portfolio (Teacher Ed, UCAPP)</td>
<td>TaskStream</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inquiry Project (Teacher Ed only)</td>
<td>Field/Supv., As. Office</td>
<td>Major advisor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surveys</td>
<td>As. Office</td>
<td>Major advisor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comprehensive Exams (Ph.D. only)</td>
<td>Major advisor</td>
<td>Major advisor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thesis/Dissertation (Grad only)</td>
<td>Major Advisor</td>
<td>Major Advisor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time to Graduate</td>
<td>Major Advisor</td>
<td>Major Advisor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certification/license</td>
<td>Major Advisor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>End-of-Program Evaluation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4. Post graduation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(also called follow-up)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surveys of Graduates</td>
<td>Assessment Office</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surveys of Employers</td>
<td>Assessment Office</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PreK-12 Student Outcomes (e.g., BEST study, Ed. Expansions study)</td>
<td>Assessment Office</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 2
ALIGNMENT OF CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK TO KEY COMPONENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Element</th>
<th>Key Component</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Theme One: Learning</td>
<td>Element One: Professional Knowledge Base</td>
<td>Admissions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>... ensure an understanding of both the theoretical and practical dimensions of the profession, working in culturally and linguistically diverse settings...</td>
<td>Mid-program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Element Two: Evidence-Based Professional Practice</td>
<td>Program completion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>... ensure a deep understanding of the theoretical and practical dimensions of professional practice and integrate theory, research, and practice... a comprehensive knowledge of professional practice includes student knowledge of, and familiarity with, relevant professional &quot;codes of ethics,&quot; an understanding of moral and ethical decision making, and professional behaviors in accordance with ethical norms of the profession.</td>
<td>Program completion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theme Two: Leading</td>
<td>Element One: Inquiry</td>
<td>Mid-program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>... provide the opportunity to become both intelligent and informed consumers of research and producers of new knowledge, informing professional practice with evidence resulting from empirical investigations.</td>
<td>Program completion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Element Two: Leadership</td>
<td>Post-graduation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(facilitate) ...leadership to effect growth and development within the student's chosen profession in particular, and in American democracy in general.</td>
<td>Post-graduation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theme Three: Lighting the Way</td>
<td>Element One: Inspiration and Diversity</td>
<td>Program completion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>... inspire our candidates to become educational leaders who are capable of lighting a fire for future leaders and practitioners so they are passionate about equity and human rights.</td>
<td>Post-graduation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

EXAMINING RELIABILITY, VALIDITY, AND AVOIDING BIAS

Instead of a single assessment, the assessment plan uses multiple assessments and methods to examine candidate performance at admission, mid-program, program completion, and post-graduation. Multiple methods help to ensure that assessments are fair, accurate, consistent, and free of bias. While assessments cannot promise this, we strive for these properties.

For example, for standardized assessment instruments such as the PRAXIS and Connecticut Administrator Test (CAT), we examine reliability, validity, and freedom from bias as contained within the technical manual produced by the developer.

Classroom assessments, including those on TaskStream, are developed according to the University of Connecticut policies. Procedures are adopted by faculty members to ensure that assessments of students are consistent, equitable and fair. For example, as part of the syllabus, faculty are encouraged to specify University policies including their procedures regarding equity and fairness in matters of race/ethnicity and gender; special needs and limited language competence; academic dishonesty; absences;
confidentiality; grading; and reporting procedures. These are consistent with the APA standards for assessment. This has resulted in an increased number of faculty using performance rubrics and electing to display those rubrics in the syllabus or on TaskStream.

For various survey instruments and evaluation forms, there are multiple contributors to each draft including the Neag Assessment Committee or a related subcommittee and the department and program leaders. When necessary, a content validation study (e.g., diversity survey) and/or factor analyses are conducted to ensure construct validity and reliability properties (e.g., alumni survey).

Also, predictive validity may be examined. This is evident in the Teacher Preparation program where student performances on PRAXIS tests, the clinical and student teaching activities, and the Inquiry Project have become good predictors of candidate success. The CAT examination and the internship experience are the culminating activities for UCAPP; the mastery learning philosophy and implementation are the culminating events of the Executive Leadership Program. Programs in School Counseling and School Psychology contend that the practicum/internship is the best predictor. The Communication Disorders Program holds that the ASHA-endorsed formative and summative assessments of the clinic experience along with the ongoing knowledge and skills student assessments are key predictors for student success. All of these predictors are the result of faculty input, clinic/intern-ship/practicum feedback, and student and alumni information.

**ON-GOING REVIEW OF THE PLAN**

There are three ways that we evaluate the assessment plan to fine-tune this document. Evaluation begins with reviewing the individual complaints, continues with the annual program reports, and is followed by the review by the committee.

The first way is the annual review of filed complaints. Each department has a process for filing formal complaints, including those tied to the assessment plan. Face-to-face meetings with the parties involved are held when complaints are from teachers, clinical supervisors, or mentors about students. When faculty members are the subject of complaints, the department leader or Associate Dean meets with the faculty member to address and resolve the issue. More specifically, in policy manuals, student manuals, and publications of our programs (all of which are on our website), potential and current students and others know that we review academic and non-academic performance each semester for purposes of determining their continuing retention in the program. Students who do not meet the expectations are not retained in the program although we attempt to assist them with finding another graduate program that may better suit their needs. In the case of the Communication Disorders Program, an alternative path, rather than certification, is recommended.

The second process is the annual reporting on all programs. This report is a request for all programs to succinctly summarize data from the four components in the assessment plan. This form also captures the program meetings (or the department meetings)
where data discussions were on the agenda. Additionally, the leader is asked what changes occurred as part of their exploration on data. These reports are routinely shared with the Neag Assessment Committee and the department chair.

The final process utilized is the review by committee members. Initially done every year but now every three years, the assessment committee conducts an evaluation. Adopted from NCATE, each member of the Neag Assessment Committee and the entire faculty is asked to rate the assessment system; the data collection, analysis, and evaluation; and the use of data for program improvement. The committee, which has representatives across all four departments and teacher education unit, receives a summary of their ratings.
PART III: DATA COLLECTION AND REPORTING

The assessment plan incorporates a system that has a wide range of assessment tools to provide information about individual candidate performance and collectively about the quality of our programs, departments, and units. In this section, the information on the data collection and reporting of these assessment tools is provided. Some of these are regularly scheduled activities, while others are episodic, often related to internal program review self-studies or in response to external program-specific accreditation agencies.

KEY ASSESSMENT ACTIVITIES

The following describes each assessment- and evaluation-related activity, including what the activity is, when it is submitted, and who are involved in the dissemination and interpretation.

Annual Assessment Activities

A. U.S. News and World Report

This annual report focuses on key indicators used for national ranking. By having a direct focus on these indicators, the school has climbed from a rank of 50 to the top 25 over the last decade. The annual cycle of reporting includes obtaining indicators in the fall, edits to the indicators in the winter, and the results announced in March. All results are shared by the Dean with the faculty and school community. They are also disseminated through various means such as the Internet and the newsletter for the school.

B. NEASC Reporting

This university-wide annual report requires each program to submit information tied to the NEASC accreditation. The annual cycle for each program’s report includes submission of the mission, goals, and at least six objectives in the fall; data collected tied to each objective; and all results-based program improvements. These reports are available through the University database system and are internally facilitated and disseminated by the Neag Assessment Office with the Dean’s Office, departments, and the Neag Assessment Committee. These reports may be summarized and shared with a wider audience through different vehicles. With this requirement, the following graphic represents the program improvement cycle that begins with our mission.

C. The University of Connecticut Academic Plan

The University of Connecticut Academic Plan is a set of goals and strategic steps that will improve the university’s performance in teaching, research, and service. The Academic Plan has a holistic goal, describes the values and themes underlying the plan,
and lists the strategies used to achieve each goal. There are five interrelated areas emphasized in the Academic Plan:

- **Undergraduate Education**: Engage undergraduates in an intellectually challenging and diverse learning environment that combines excellent opportunities in the liberal arts and sciences with strong pre-professional education, co-curricular activities, and research collaborations with members of the faculty.

- **Graduate and Professional Education**: Sustain and develop select graduate and professional programs of national and international distinction.

- **Research, Scholarship, and Creativity Activity**: Enhance the benefits to the state, Nation, and world from faculty, staff, and student research, scholarship, and creative activity by increasing productivity, building on our existing strengths and focused areas of excellence, developing a stronger extramural funding portfolio, and expanding the infrastructure that supports research and strengthens our ability to translate new discoveries into practical applications, including our capacity in the area of technology transfer.

- **Diversity**: Ensure an enriched learning and work environment by creating a more inclusive community that recognizes and celebrates individual differences.

- **Public Engagement**: Enhance the contributions of UConn faculty, staff, and students to the state, Nation, and world through appropriate collaboration with partners in both the public and private sectors (http://academicplan.uconn.edu/files/UConnAcademicPlan.pdf)

The Neag School and all other schools have fleshed out their own Academic Plan (see http://www.education.uconn.edu/ncate/eer/).

D. Neag Program Concentration/Program Report

The Neag School’s annual report for each program captures a deeper, synthesized self-assessment. All programs submit reports that succinctly summarize data from each of the four components in the assessment plan. This form also captures the program meetings (or the department meetings) where data discussions were on the agenda. The form includes reporting on alignment studies, time frames, dissemination, results, and information used in association with program improvement.

E. Neag Reports

A number of reports are facilitated by the Assessment Office. This includes test summary reports; survey reports; and, the evaluation reports on clinical practices and practicum/internship evaluations. These reports are shared by the Assessment Office with the Dean’s Office and the program and/or department leaders. They are also disseminated to the Neag Assessment Committee, and its subcommittees, as applicable. Many are available via the Internet to our full school community.
Systematic Reports

F. Neag Alumni Survey Report

At least once every four years, the Neag School administers a survey to alumni from our departments and the Teacher Education program. The survey data are analyzed and reported. This report is shared by the Assessment Office with the Dean’s Office, department leaders, and the Neag Assessment Committee and related subcommittees. The members of these committees are then asked to discuss results and implications at faculty meetings. To supplement the school-wide alumni survey, programs may administer an additional survey every two years.

G. Neag Alumni Employer Report

At least once every four years, the Neag School administers employer surveys. There are multiple forms to make sure we determine the unique characteristics of programs. The survey data are analyzed and reported. This report is shared by the Assessment Office with the Dean’s Office, department leaders, and the Neag Assessment Committee. The members of this committee are then asked to discuss results and implications at faculty meetings. To supplement the school-wide employer survey, programs may administer an additional survey every two years.

H. Program Accreditation Reports

Periodically, many programs go through an accreditation process. In many ways this is similar to NEASC accreditation process but at a program(s) level. This process includes self review followed by a visit from their accreditation team. While each program(s) has a different timeline for embarking on accreditation, there are much data gathered, analyzed, and interpreted leading to program improvement. (Each of the agencies sponsoring accreditation processes are detailed in the next section of this report.)

I. Ad Hoc Reports

There is an occasionally a need for the Neag School to produce ad hoc reports. These reports are based on surveys, focus groups or individual interviews, and studies. For example, the Assessment Office pursues assessment research projects across various themes. This has included analyzing three years of UCAPP admission interview forms and examined inter-rater agreement. The Neag School’s partnership with Professional Development Schools is investigated by analyzing surveys. Similarly, student and teacher survey results about teaching and counseling clinical experiences are studied. The Athletic Training program was assisted in going through all of the instruments used. Based upon factor analyses, they could refine these instruments. Focus groups assist the Physical Therapy program through a comprehensive evaluation of the program. Follow-up studies produced with the Connecticut State Department of Education on the positions are by alumni in Connecticut public schools.
# Table 3

## Alignment of Key Elements to Assessment Activities and Conceptual Framework

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Components</th>
<th>Assessment Activities</th>
<th>Conceptual Framework Element</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Admissions</td>
<td>X X X X X</td>
<td>Professional Knowledge Base ... ensure an understanding of both the theoretical and practical dimensions of the profession, working in culturally and linguistically diverse settings...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Mid-program (also called preparation program)</td>
<td>X X X X X</td>
<td>Professional Knowledge Base (see above) Evidence-Based Professional Practice ... ensure a deep understanding of the theoretical and practical dimensions of professional practice and integrate theory, research, and practice.... a comprehensive knowledge of professional practice includes student knowledge of, and familiarity with, relevant professional “codes of ethics,” an understanding of moral and ethical decision making, and professional behaviors in accordance with ethical norms of the profession</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Program completion (also called clinical, student teacher, internship, practicum experiences or authentic experiences)</td>
<td>X X X X X X</td>
<td>Evidence-Based Professional Practice (see above) Inquiry ... provide the opportunity to become both intelligent and informed consumers of research and producers of new knowledge, informing professional practice with evidence resulting from empirical investigations Leadership (facilitate) ...leadership to effect growth and development within the student’s chosen profession in particular, and in American democracy in general. Inspiration and Diversity ... inspire our candidates to become educational leaders who are capable of lighting a fire for future leaders and practitioners so that are passionate about equity and human rights.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Post-graduation (also called follow-up)</td>
<td>X X X X X X X</td>
<td>Inquiry (see above) Leadership (see above) Inspiration and Diversity (see above)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A-H refer to assessment activities mentioned earlier (i.e., A=U.S. News and World Reports, B=NEASC Reports, C=Academic Plan, D=Neag Program Reports, E=Neag/TNE Reports, F=Neag/TNE Alumni Survey Reports, G=Neag/TNE Employer Survey Reports, H=Accreditation Reports, I=Ad Hoc Assessment Activities).
PART IV: ASSESSMENT FACILITATION

The Neag school embraces a culture of assessment that uses data for improvement purposes. The Office of Assessment works with the Neag School community to oversee assessment and evaluation services that provide valid data-based decisions. The goal is to improve educational outcomes within the Neag School of Education for the four departments and for the Teacher Education unit. The following vision and mission (which had been internalized, but now have been endorsed by the Neag Assessment Committee) are noted below.

VISION

The Neag School of Education will be recognized as having an Office of Assessment whose vision is to serve as a national model of excellence, embracing and promoting an assessment culture characterized by evidence-based decisions, with the intended purpose of providing a more challenging, learner-centered academic community that advances knowledge and improves vitality in all aspects of the School.

MISSION

The Office of Assessment is an innovative, supportive unit that:

- Enhances the school’s assessment culture by encouraging evidence-based decisions which may advance knowledge, improve teaching, and transform learning.
- Focuses its efforts on providing support, especially for accreditation purposes, by providing annual external and internal reports, facilitating survey and evaluation implementation, conducting assessment and program evaluation research, and implementing the strategic initiative known as Spotlight on Assessment.
- Serves the School and the University in committee work, while also being the hub with regional, state and national assessment communities.

VALUES

The Office of Assessment works diligently with the dean, associate dean, department chairs, directors, program leaders, other administrators, faculty, staff, students, and key stakeholders in the School and the University. It encourages adherence to follow the
national student, program, and personnel evaluation standards developed by the Joint Committee on Standards for Program Evaluation, Guidelines and Standards for Educational Evaluation (AERA, APA, NCME), Standards for Educational and Psychological Testing (AERA, APA, NCME), and Code of Fair Testing Practices in Education (Joint Committee on Testing Practices – APA, AERA, NCME, ASHA, NASP, NATD). It should be noted that the director has been a contributor to the developments of these standards, and she is one of a dozen authors of the publication by the Joint Committee on Testing Practices.

**Strategic Strategies/Responsibilities**

The **responsibilities** of the Office primarily include:

- Facilitating the assessment systems required of all accreditation agencies (e.g., NEASC, NCATE, CAPTE, CAATE, and APA).
- Compiling external assessment reports such as the *US News & World Report*, ETS Praxis Assessment Student and School Reports, Title II Report, US Department of Education PEDS Report, Department of Higher Education Annual Report, and NEASC Assessment Reports.
- Collecting, analyzing, and reporting on internal reports for topics including standardized assessments.
- Identifying, collecting, and analyzing quantitative and qualitative data on a school-wide level and providing analytical support for decisions leading to program, department and/or school improvement.
- Managing the design of systems for collection and analysis of student learning.
- Overseeing the development and implementation report of instruments in connection with faculty, staff, students, and professionals.
- Conducting and disseminating assessment and program evaluation research information.
- Educating the school community about the role of appropriate collaboration/participation in academic assessment and the measurement of student learning.
- Providing leadership for the Teachers for a New Era (TNE) Carnegie grant for all assessment and research efforts geared to our teacher preparation program.
- Implementing a strategic plan to facilitate a culture of assessment so that decisions are evidence-based.
- Implementing an agenda of assessment research.
- Other duties as assigned by the dean or the associate dean.

**Support**

The philosophy embraced by the Office of Assessment and supported by the Dean’s Office and the Neag Assessment Committee is that each person has ownership in assessment as the Neag School strives for a model of excellence, embracing and promoting a culture characterized by evidence-based decisions. One full-time member—
a director—facilitates this process. She uses a collaborative process, employing committees, and a dedicated cadre of graduate assistants, to accomplish the mission. Assessment is further supported by the Neag Assessment Committee (NAC) and our various subcommittees. The NAC team has representation across all levels (students, faculty, staff, administrators) and units (four departments and the teacher education unit), and is chaired by the director.
The development of this assessment plan with a collection and reporting system is aligned with the requirement of various accreditation agencies. In this section, we have a description of the university academic plan and each accreditation organization (or SPAs or state requirements), which includes how long the agency has conducted reviews; when we were last reviewed; when we will expect the next review; the number of years the “status” is for; what areas are generally reviewed; and, how it is reviewed. Also described is the important role of assessment in the accreditation organization’s review process.

**NEW ENGLAND ASSOCIATION FOR SCHOOLS AND COLLEGES**

The University of Connecticut, including the Neag School, is accredited by the New England Association of Schools & Colleges, Inc. (NEASC). Founded in 1885, NEASC is the Nation’s oldest regional accrediting association whose mission is the establishment and maintenance of high levels of education, from pre-kindergarten through the higher education doctoral level. The NEASC Commission on Institutions of Higher Education (NEASC CIHE) is the regional accrediting agency for over 200 colleges and universities in the six New England states: Connecticut, Maine, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, Rhode Island and Vermont.

The University of Connecticut started with a self-study process leading up to the 2007 re-accreditation. The Steering Committee appointments were made in 2004, and the 11 Standards committees were appointed and began working. To facilitate transparency and encourage university-wide contribution to the self-study effort, a NEASC Accreditation website, [www.neasc.uconn.edu](http://www.neasc.uconn.edu), was established. In mid-spring of 2006, all committees submitted their chapters. In the summer of 2006, the document was then submitted to the staff of the NEASC CIHE for its comments. After revision based on the NEASC CIHE staff comments, the entire draft of the self-study was put on the Re-accreditation website in October of 2006, and university community comment solicited. Based on this input, the self-study was revised for the final time and sent to the review team and NEASC in early December of 2006. Third party comment, to be sent to the NEASC CIHE, was solicited in mid-December, 2006. The plan is available at: [http://www.neasc.uconn.edu/docs/standards_for_accreditation_2005.pdf](http://www.neasc.uconn.edu/docs/standards_for_accreditation_2005.pdf)

The following are the assessment principles NEASC emphasizes: there is no one best way to assess institutional effectiveness; there is no prescription that an institution must use in measuring or demonstrating its effectiveness; successful assessment efforts are compatible with the institution’s mission and its available resources; assessment is evolutionary, ongoing, and incremental; and ultimately, assessment and accreditation share the common goal of enabling the institution to reach its fullest academic potential by providing the highest quality education possible.
The National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) is a national accrediting body for schools, colleges, and departments of education authorized by the U.S. Department of Education. NCATE determines which schools, colleges, and departments of education meet rigorous national standards in preparing teachers and other specialists for schools. Accreditation, once granted, is continuous as long as the institution fulfills its responsibilities under NCATE’s continuing accreditation process. Continuing accreditation status is granted after an institution has been accredited. Continuing accreditation requires institutions to file annual reports and host an on-site Board of Examiners team in a defined cycle. NCATE encompasses administrator education, school counseling, school psychology, speech, and teacher education in various fields such as elementary, English, mathematics, social studies, world languages and special education. Each of these areas has sponsoring agencies that are noted below. Each area has been aligned with this Neag School of Education Assessment Plan.

ASSOCIATION FOR EARLY CHILDHOOD EDUCATION INTERNATIONAL (ACEI)

The Elementary Teacher Education program is a Specialty Professional Association (SPA) through the Association for Early Childhood Education International (ACEI) which is a constituent member of NCATE. ACEI is responsible for the Program Review process for NCATE. Information on the ACEI/NCATE partnership can be found at [http://www.acei.org/standhp.htm](http://www.acei.org/standhp.htm). ACEI requires that teacher preparation programs must have a broad foundation in the sciences, humanities and social sciences, with advanced study in at least one specialty area to be able to optimally expand children's abilities to grow and develop in all areas. There are 11 broad areas of preparation for elementary teachers. Additionally, ACEI looks for evidence of learning in the areas of foundations, child development, and learning and teaching. Perhaps most importantly, ACEI notes that teacher preparation programs for pre-service elementary teachers should provide carefully administered, sequenced and supervised clinical/field experiences in all areas of the elementary curriculum. Pre-service teachers should have gradually increased responsibilities in the classroom. They should be provided with opportunities to work with children at various grade levels, with a variety of culturally diverse backgrounds, and with different capabilities, including mainstreamed or included special education children, and in activities that link course content to practice. They should be expected to critically select and use appropriate materials, resources and technology, and to have experiences with classroom management and a variety of evaluation techniques. Collaboration with other professionals in the school setting should be encouraged to develop team building skills and utilization of all resources to enhance children's learning. Opportunities to be coached and to coach should be provided. Pre-service teachers should have the opportunity to interact with parents and to develop skills for communicating with parents.

The elementary education program at the Neag School strives to offer each candidate experiences consistent or exceeding the ACEI standards making use of our Professional Development School (PDS) network for quality school placements in each year of the
program and TaskStream for documenting the performance of candidates in their university coursework and clinic experiences. This is in alignment with the Neag School of Education Assessment Plan. ACEI/NCATE standards and rubrics can be found at [http://www.acei.org/ncateindex.htm](http://www.acei.org/ncateindex.htm).

**NATIONAL COUNCIL OF TEACHERS OF ENGLISH**

The National Council of Teachers of English (NCTE) has articulated the standards for future English language arts teachers and is a SPA through NCATE. The NCTE Guidelines, now called Program Standards, were first approved by NCATE in April 1987, with the most recent revision approved in August 2007. The Program Standards apply to all initial programs for the preparation of secondary English language arts teachers, Grades 7–12. The NCTE/NCATE program standards are easily accessible at: [http://www.ncte.org/prog/ncate/107902.htm](http://www.ncte.org/prog/ncate/107902.htm).

The NCTE Program Standards for the preparation of English language arts teachers (Grades 7-12) are comprised of four (4) components:

1. **Program Structure:** Candidates follow a specific curriculum and are expected to meet appropriate performance assessments for pre-service English language arts teachers.

2. **Candidate Attitudes:** Through modeling, advisement, instruction, field experiences, assessment of performance, and involvement in professional organizations, candidates adopt and strengthen professional attitudes needed by English language arts teachers.

3. **Candidate Knowledge:** Candidates are knowledgeable about language; literature; oral, visual, and written literacy; print and non-print media; technology; and research theory and findings.

4. **Candidate Pedagogy:** Candidates acquire and demonstrate the dispositions and skills needed to integrate knowledge of English language arts, students, and teaching.

Six to eight assessments are required as evidence for demonstrating pre-service teacher competence across the NCTE Program Standards. To meet the NCTE Program Standards, pre-service English education students in the Teacher Preparation program at our institution are assessed through several data sources, ranging from standardized test performance (Praxis) to transcript analysis (for content courses) to field experience evaluations (particularly student teaching and Master’s internship experiences), along with demonstrations of ability to prepare instructional materials and work with diverse populations of students (lesson plans and unit designs) and capacity for research and reflective teaching (i.e., inquiry project). This is in alignment with the Neag School of Education Assessment Plan.
The National Council of Teachers of Mathematics (NCTM) has supplied the standards for future Prekindergarten-12 teachers of mathematics since 1982 and is a SPA through NCATE. The program standards have been reviewed and updated four times including most recently in 2003. The NCTM/NCATE program standards are available at http://www.nctm.org/ncate.aspx. The National Council of Teachers of Mathematics identifies 10 standards of mathematical achievement to be carried through four divisions (Prekindergarten-2, 3-5, 6-8, and 9-12) of the education system. The standards are divided into both Content Standards and Process Standards that are accompanied by two to four specified goals and multiple indicators that apply across each grade level.

To meet NCTM Program Standards, program reports must be submitted to NCATE and reviewed by NCTM-trained reviewers. The program report must demonstrate that 80% of indicators are addressed with at least one indicator in each of the 10 Standards. Each program must also provide evidence of a state-required licensure or certification exam. Unless using the Praxis II mathematics content exam, which has already been aligned to the NCTM Standards and Indicators, programs must show evidence of alignment to the NCTM Standards and Indicators by providing a thorough description of the exam with specific explanations as to how it aligns to the NCTM Standards and Indicators. This is in alignment with the Neag School of Education Assessment Plan.

The National Science Teachers Association (NSTA), a SPA through NCATE, has articulated the standards for future K-12 science teachers even before the publication of the National Science Education Standards in 1996. Because “science teacher” represents a broad array of disciplines, the NSTA Standards for Science Teacher Preparation have relied upon recommendations supplied by the American Association of Physics Teachers, the American Chemical Society, the National Association of Biology Teachers, and the National Earth Science Teachers Association. Consequently, areas under review include Biology, Physics, Chemistry, Earth Science, and General Science—all at the secondary level. Guidelines can be easily accessed by visiting the NSTA site, “Standards for Teacher Preparation” (http://www.nsta.org/pd/ncate).

The NSTA Standards fall into these categories: content knowledge, instructional preparation, field experiences, as well as content specific considerations (e.g., safety and welfare, conducting scientific research). This information is detailed in the NSTA Assessment Matrix (http://www.nsta.org/pdfs/NCATE-AssessmentsMatrix.pdf).

The expectation is that teacher candidates will be assessed through a combination of standardized test performance (Praxis), transcript analysis (for content courses), and field experience evaluations (esp. student teaching and internship), along with demonstrations of an ability to prepare instructional materials (lesson plans and unit
The National Council for the Social Studies (NCSS) provides the standards for future Social Studies teachers and is a SPA through NCATE. The NCSS Guidelines were developed in 1997 and updated in 2002. The Program Standards apply to all initial programs for the preparation of secondary social studies teachers, Grades 7–12. The NCSS/NCATE program standards are available at [http://www.socialstudies.org/ncate/](http://www.socialstudies.org/ncate/).

The NCSS Program Standards for the preparation of social studies grades 7-12 teachers are comprised of 3 components for 10 themes. The components are:

1. **Programmatic Evidence**: Content knowledge and skills; Pedagogical knowledge and skills
2. **Test Evidence**: Internal test evidence; External test evidence
3. **Performance Evidence**: Candidate abilities to develop effective lesson plans; Candidate abilities to apply pedagogical and professional knowledge, skills and dispositions effectively in a clinical setting; Candidate effects on P-12 student learning

To meet the NCSS Program Standards, pre-service social studies education students in the Teacher Preparation program at our institution are assessed through a variety of data sources including, but not limited to the Praxis Exam (standardized test performance), field experience evaluations, analysis of transcripts, demonstrations of ability to prepare instructional materials and work with diverse populations of students (lesson plans and unit designs), and capacity for research and reflective teaching. This is in alignment with the *Neag School of Education Assessment Plan*.

The World Language Education program is accredited by the American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages (ACTFL) and is a SPA through NCATE. While the ACTFL was founded in 2002, it has only been responsible for the Program Review process for NCATE since 2004. Information on the ACTFL/NCATE partnership, including the 2005 revisions, can be found at [http://www.actfl.org/i4a/pages/index.cfm?pageid=3384](http://www.actfl.org/i4a/pages/index.cfm?pageid=3384). The current Standards of the ACTFL are comprised of six content sections. Each of the six Standards is supplemented with supporting standards, supporting explanations, and rubrics. To meet ACTFL Program Standards, programs must show that candidates are proficient in each of the six Standards above. Explicit and detailed explanations can be found in the Program Standards webpage listed above. More generally, though, candidates must submit a list of assessments, explanations of the relationships of the
assessments to the Standards, evidence for meeting the Standards, and documentation showing the use of assessment results to improve candidate and program performance to the ACTFL. This is in alignment with the Neag School of Education Assessment Plan. More information can be found on the ACTFL webpage at [http://www.actfl.org/files/public/ACTFLNCATEStandardsRevised713.pdf](http://www.actfl.org/files/public/ACTFLNCATEStandardsRevised713.pdf).

**COUNCIL FOR EXCEPTIONAL CHILDREN**

The Special Education Teacher Preparation Program within the Department of Educational Psychology is reviewed by the Council for Exceptional Children (CEC) and is a SPA through NCATE. CEC is the largest international professional organization dedicated to improving educational outcomes for individuals with exceptionalities, students with disabilities, and/or the gifted.

The NCATE recently approved new CEC performance-based standards for the preparation and licensure of special educators. The new CEC standards are divided into three parts: Field Experiences and Clinical Practice Standard, Assessment System Standards, and Special Education Content Standards.

The CEC Special Education Content Standards are made up of standards in 10 domain areas which include (1) Foundations, (2) Development and Characteristics of Learners, (3) Individual Learning Differences, (4) Learning Environments and Social Interactions, (5) Instructional Strategies, (6) Language, (7) Instructional Planning, (8) Assessment, (9) Professional and Ethical Practice, and (10) Collaboration. These domain areas parallel the 10 Interstate New Teacher and Assessment Consortium (INTASC) principles. The narrative Content Standards were written to reflect the content of validated knowledge and skills.

**INTERNATIONAL READING ASSOCIATION (IRA)**

The International Reading Association has managed the standards for future reading professionals including paraprofessionals, classroom teachers, reading specialists, teacher educators, and administrators. A SPA through NCATE, IRA has managed these standards through its partnership with NCATE since 1980. The most recent revisions occurred in 2003 and can be found on the IRA site, [http://www.reading.org/resources/community/ncate_standards.html](http://www.reading.org/resources/community/ncate_standards.html).

There are five Core Standards presented by the IRA: foundational knowledge; instructional strategies and curriculum materials; assessment, diagnosis, and evaluation; creating a literate environment; and professional development. The IRA requires that candidates provide contextual information about the program, examples of assessments (seven to eight, with scoring guides), a Standards assessment chart (showing which assessments connect with which Standards), evidence for meeting the Standards, and evidence that the assessment results are used to improve candidate and program
performance. State-licensure or certification exams should be presented as an example of assessment alongside the other seven to eight assessments. This is in alignment with the Neag School of Education Assessment Plan.

COUNCIL FOR ACCREDITATION OF COUNSELING AND RELATED EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMS (CACREP)

The School Counseling Program in the Department of Educational Psychology at the Neag School is accredited by the Council for Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs (CACREP) and is a part of NCATE. CACREP was created by the ACA to develop, implement, and maintain standards of preparation for graduate level degree programs in counseling. Its purpose is to work with such programs so that they might achieve accreditation status. CACREP has held status as a nationally recognized accrediting agency since 1987.

The multi-step accreditation process involves: (a) programmatic self-study; (b) documentation of a program’s compliance with the standards; (c) validation of the submitted documentation by an on-site visiting team; (d) rendering of accreditation decisions by the CACREP Board based upon the written self-study, on-site team report, and institutional response to the team report; and (e) interim reports as needed and mid-cycle reports to provide for periodic review of a program’s compliance with specified standards. CACREP’s accreditation process includes the assessment of a program’s ability to meet the profession’s standards at: (http://www.doe.state.in.us/dps/Standards/CounselorContStds.html).

CACREP accredited UConn’s School Counseling Master’s program for a 2-year period through October 31, 2009, with one condition; that is, evidence that a newly developed course entitled, “Human Growth and Development over the Lifespan: Implications for Counseling” has been taught. This condition was satisfied at the completion of the spring 2008 semester at which time the program will most likely be permitted to continue its accreditation status until October 31, 2015.

As the Neag School of Education Assessment Plan articulates the importance of assessment, this plays a prominent role in CACREP’s review process. An entire section of the programmatic self-study entitled “Evaluations in the Program” is focused on assessment. For example, the program is expected to conduct a series of regularly scheduled formal and informal assessments annually. Data for these assessments are gathered from multiple sources and include input from program faculty, current and former students, personnel in cooperating agencies and program graduate employers. In addition, an official report that documents outcomes of these assessments is prepared and distributed on a systematic basis to students currently in the program, program faculty, institutional administrators, and personnel in cooperating agencies (e.g., employers, site supervisors). At least once every 3 years program faculty must document an evaluation of this program.

The major 2007 findings from the most recent triennial evaluation, aligned with the Neag School of Education Assessment Plan, revealed the following: (a) the program’s
goals/objectives are aligned with the goals/objectives of CACREP, (b) the courses in the curriculum are consistent with CACREP standards as well as with state and national standards for school counselor training and certification, (c) there is increasing diversity represented by the program applicants as well as those admitted to the program, (d) program graduates are satisfied with the program as well as with their levels of preparation for their careers, (e) internships add a “real life” component to the program, and (f) employers are pleased with the program’s graduates.

COUNCIL ON ACADEMIC ACCREDITATION IN AUDIOLOGY AND SPEECH-LANGUAGE PATHOLOGY

The Communication Disorders Program of the Department of Communication Sciences is reviewed by the Council on Academic Accreditation in Audiology and Speech-Language Pathology (CAA) and is a part of NCATE. This is an activity of the ASHA, the professional organization that oversees and issues certification for practicing speech-language pathologists and audiologists and of educational programs that prepare them.

The CAA accreditation model has been the single nationally recognized accreditor for the professions of audiology and speech-language pathology since the 1960s. Today, the accreditation activities for programs that prepare individuals to enter the professions are conducted by the Council on Academic Accreditation in Audiology and Speech-Language Pathology (CAA).

The review process comprises three parts: self-study, on-site visit(s) by a team of evaluators appointed by the CAA, and an analysis and evaluation of the data collected from both the self-study and the visit(s), along with any correspondence generated by interviews with stakeholders (i.e., students, consumers of the clinic’s services, employers of program graduates, and so forth).

The Communication Disorders Program was initially accredited in speech-language pathology by this agency in 1966 and for audiology in 1969; the current accreditation cycle is for the period of 2002–2009. The process of applying for continued accreditation, or re-accreditation, will commence in 2008; new standards for accrediting programs in communication sciences and disorders were approved by ASHA in July 2006 with an implementation date of January 1, 2008. Hence, new standards will be applied for this upcoming reaccreditation process; they are accessed through this link: http://www.asha.org/NR/rdonlyres/686AF94D-5DA9-4D2C-96FB-2CA5E047527F/0/AccreditationStds0307.pdf

Outcomes of the CAA and university-related self-study led to many substantive changes to both the content and the administration of the graduate program in Communication Disorders and the Speech and Hearing Clinic. The program was recognized for its use of a school setting directly linked to the program. It provided students an excellent model for service delivery within a public school setting. Further, the clinic’s provision of an accent modification program provides students with an increased exposure to diversity.

---

1 While not part of the Neag School of Education, this program is included in this assessment plan because it is part of the “unit” for NCATE accreditation for the University of Connecticut.
within the curriculum. Strengths of the program were cited as effective leadership, commitment of the faculty, strong student support, thorough and consistent supervision of students in their assessment and treatment activities, a robust record of scholarship and publications from the faculty, support by clients of the clinic, and an exemplary supervisor-clinician model that fosters a sense of professionalism for students.

**AMERICAN PSYCHOLOGICAL ASSOCIATION; NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF SCHOOL PSYCHOLOGISTS**

The School Psychology Doctoral Program in the Department of Educational Psychology is accredited by the American Psychological Association (APA) and is a SPA through NCATE through the National Association of School Psychologists (NASP).

**Doctoral Program in School Psychology**

In December 1945, the APA was asked by the Veterans' Administration for a list of Universities that could provide doctoral level preparation of clinical psychologists. Subsequently, 22 universities were identified as meeting faculty and facilities criteria. Currently, there are 360 accredited doctoral programs in professional psychology that encompasses the traditional substantive areas of clinical, counseling, and school psychology.

The doctoral program in school psychology at the University of Connecticut initially gained APA accreditation on May 1, 2001. The next reaccreditation review is scheduled for fall, 2009. The accreditation process involves self-study and external review intended to evaluate, enhance, and publicly recognize the quality of the program. Both a site visit team and the CoA review the degree to which the program complies with accreditation domains and standards that include: eligibility; program philosophy, objectives, and curriculum plan; program resources; sensitivity to cultural and individual differences and diversity; student-faculty relations; program self-assessment and quality enhancement; public disclosure; and relationship with APA. For a complete description of domains and standards for accreditation see: [http://www.apa.org/ed/accreditation/](http://www.apa.org/ed/accreditation/).

The program’s assessment procedures were adopted on the bases that they possessed both acceptable face validity and utility, and that they addressed the program’s philosophy, department and university requirements, and desired student outcomes. Further, selection and design of assessment procedures were influenced by the need to have continuous monitoring of students’ satisfactory progression through the program that incorporated different methods, varied data sources, and different environments. Consequently, multiple and continual qualitative and quantitative procedures designed to allow both formative and summative assessments are used to determine the degree to which the program is meeting its goals, complying with departmental and university requirements, and the standards espoused by the APA. The data derived from these assessments are also used to promote informed decision-making to allow for further development and quality enhancement of the program.
Students are assessed throughout their programs of study relative to their professional characteristics, academic knowledge, and practitioner competencies through a variety of methods beginning with: (a) pre-admission assessments; (b) formal evaluations such as course grades; (c) faculty reviews of student progress; (d) performance on the Master's Qualifying Examinations (if students entered the doctoral program at the baccalaureate level); (e) performance on the General Examination that incorporates both the National School Psychology Examination, and an applied, research-related, examination that may include both written and oral components; (f) assessments of student progress through feedback from practica and internship field-based supervisors; (h) conduction and defense of dissertations; and (i) an alumni survey that functions to obtain an anonymous student critique of the program, and a self-assessment of their competencies relative to stated program goals from a distal vantage point. These assessment activities are in alignment with the Neag School of Education Assessment Plan.

Master's/Sixth-Year Program in School Psychology

NASP was founded in 1969. Consistent with its mission, NASP adopted and promotes an integrated set of comprehensive standards for preparation, credentialing, and professional practice of school psychology. NASP training standards were initially approved by the NCATE in 1982 for the review and accreditation of school psychology programs at the sixth-year/specialist and doctoral levels. In 1988, NCATE began to accredit education “units” (i.e., the administrative unit that houses professional education programs, typically the college of education), rather than programs. Concurrently, NCATE authorized the review of programs by professional member associations such as NASP for whom standards had been approved by NCATE. The Master's/Sixth-Year School Psychology Program at the University of Connecticut gained full approval in 1991, and NASP Approved status and NCATE Nationally Recognized status for the period January 1, 2007 through December 31, 2013. NCATE/NASP's Program Approval Board reviews programs to ensure they provide students with a knowledge base in psychology and education, including theories, models, empirical findings, and techniques in each of the following domains: data-based decision-making consultation; effective instruction; human development; diversity; systems organization; prevention; research and program development; history and foundations; and information technology. The programs are also reviewed to ensure students demonstrate the professional skills necessary to deliver effective services that result in positive outcomes. For a complete description of standards see http://nasponline.org/.

NATIONAL POLICY BOARD FOR EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATION

The National Policy Board for Educational Administration (NPBEA) is used for the UCAPP and Executive Leadership Programs in the Department of Educational Leadership. Their link is available at: http://www.npbea.org/ELCC/ELCCStandards%20_5-02.pdf.

Assessment is an important component of the review process. Several forms of assessment are used for the programs: admissions information, course grades, reports
from clinical supervisors, and assessments from on-site mentors who supervise internships, field-projects, cumulative e-portfolio for each student, follow-up student surveys, and follow-up employer surveys. In fact, based on 2007-2008 information, we have fine-tuned key assessment-related activities. This has included: a rubric for rating students during the admissions process; a curriculum map that links each of the NPBEA standards with course requirements; an internship assessment that documents how well students addressed the NPBEA standards in practice; on TaskStream we have multiple rubrics that document student progress in each course and in each clinical placement; and, on TaskStream we have an e-portfolio of student work.

**COMMISSION FOR ACCREDITATION OF PHYSICAL THERAPY EDUCATION (CAPTE)**

The Physical Therapy Program at the Neag School is accredited by the Commission for Accreditation of Physical Therapy Education (CAPTE).

CAPTE began accrediting Physical Therapy Education programs in 1987. The program at the University of Connecticut was last accredited for a 10 year period in 2011. The next cycle of self-study and on-site evaluation will occur in 2020 and 2021. The program evaluation is comprehensive. The CAPTE accreditation process details are available at in the CAPTE Accreditation Handbook at: [http://www.apta.org/AM/Template.cfm?Section=CAPTE1&CONTENTID=40794&TEMPLATE=/CM/ContentDisplay.cfm](http://www.apta.org/AM/Template.cfm?Section=CAPTE1&CONTENTID=40794&TEMPLATE=/CM/ContentDisplay.cfm).

For a Physical Therapy Education program to be accredited, progressive, and train students to be successful professionals and leaders in their field, it is necessary for programs to use assessment tools for improvement and innovation. Under CAPTE criteria assessment occurs at a number of levels that include, but are not limited to: graduation rates and attrition, passing rate on the Physical Therapy Licensure Examination, data gathered from students and clinical instructors during the program and information gathered from graduates and graduate employers. Specific information regarding the evaluation criteria is found at: [http://www.apta.org/AM/Template.cfm?Section=CAPTE1&Template=/CM/ContentDisplay.cfm&ContentID=19980](http://www.apta.org/AM/Template.cfm?Section=CAPTE1&Template=/CM/ContentDisplay.cfm&ContentID=19980).

The Physical Therapy Program, the first in a public university, has maintained an accredited status since the inception of CAPTE. Substantial changes continue to occur in the physical therapy profession including a vision of autonomous practice for physical therapists. These changes have also resulted in significant revisions of the education criteria. This vision of autonomous practice has also raised the bar of physical therapy education programs. Presently more than 90% of institutions sponsoring physical therapy education award a Doctor of Physical Therapy degree.
The Athletic Training Education Program in the Department of Kinesiology at the Neag School is accredited by the Commission on Accreditation of Athletic Training Education (CAATE). The JRC-AT was incorporated in Texas in October 1991. The JRC-AT was a Committee on Accreditation under the CAAHEP; effective June 30, 2006, the JRC-AT became independent from CAAHEP and changed its name to the CAATE. The program underwent the reaccreditation process in the fall of 2007, and received the 7 years of accreditation.

As outlined in the Accreditation Standards for Entry-Level Athletic Training established by CAATE, programs must routinely secure qualitative and quantitative data to determine the outcomes and effectiveness of the program. These outcomes must relate to the program’s stated educational mission and goals and include measures related to didactic and clinical instruction, student learning (both clinical and didactic), and overall program effectiveness: [http://caate.net/documents/standards.12.7.07.pdf](http://caate.net/documents/standards.12.7.07.pdf).

There are several ways in which the Athletic Training program currently evaluates its overall effectiveness as a program, which are in alignment with the [Neag School of Education Assessment Plan](http://www.education.uconn.edu/departments/ekin/ATHL.cfm). Student progress is evaluated each semester in three ways: completion of each course with a “C” or better, performance on clinical proficiency skills sheets, and assessment with an evaluation performance rubric. The clinical instructors/clinical sites are evaluated twice each academic semester with routine site visits by faculty, as well as students’ mid-semester and final evaluations of their CI/Clinical Sites. Overall program effectiveness is then evaluated by the clinical instructors and the students. All assessment tools, which are reviewed annually for program improvements, can be found on the Athletic Training website at: [http://www.education.uconn.edu/departments/ekin/ATHL.cfm](http://www.education.uconn.edu/departments/ekin/ATHL.cfm).
The Neag School of Education’s Office of Assessment, has a multi-faceted strategic initiative, *Spotlight on Assessment*, to spread the word on assessment-related topics and to foster a culture of assessment. Elements of *Spotlight on Assessment* include: participatory involvement on issues about assessment, department meetings covering assessment agenda items, website for the school community, a series of assessment colloquia, and forums/conferences.

**DISCUSSION AT FACULTY MEETINGS ON ASSESSMENT**

As part of the *Spotlight on Assessment* initiative, each department leader is now asked to regularly discuss “assessment” at monthly faculty meetings. Starting in the spring of 2008, the Neag Assessment Committee members have been available to assist with this agenda item. The Assessment Office is also available for these presentations and discussions. Additionally, assessment agenda items are presented to the Neag Assessment Committee members to consider for inclusion at departmental faculty meetings.

**ACTIVE PARTICIPATION THROUGH COMMITTEES ON ASSESSMENT**

At the Neag School, a participatory model is sought in the area of assessment. As such, we now have the Neag Assessment Committee and related subcommittees focused on assessment as part of the *Spotlight on Assessment* initiative. The Neag Assessment Committee’s general charge is to assist in the development, implementation, and refinement of the *Neag School of Education Assessment Plan* to ensure a participatory model across all departments and programs. Outcomes of this process may include the development of instruments and protocols, the implementation of assessment designs, data analyses, and feedback on assessment initiatives. The NAC is about a 25-member group that includes two to three faculty and up to three students from the Teacher Education program and each of the four departments.

**INFORMATION ON ASSESSMENT DISSEMINATED**

As part of the *Spotlight on Assessment* initiative, various avenues are taken to inform our “community” about assessment. For example, we have a web site with many reports, colloquium sessions, News Briefs, and other assessment-related items.
A series of colloquia has been established as part of the *Spotlight on Assessment* initiative. These colloquia focus on important topics concerning assessment. More specifically, they focus on the diverse range of assessment components across each of the programs in the four departments of Neag.

Presenters include faculty and other professionals with knowledge of timely and pertinent assessment topics. Past presenters have included University of Connecticut faculty, Connecticut State Department of Education managers, and representatives from companies, and other institutions. All announcements are posted on the website and presenters’ colloquia materials are archived online.
Another aspect of the Spotlight on Assessment initiative is statewide forums/conferences. The annual assessment conferences involve speakers from national, state, local and university organizations. Past speakers have been from the U.S. Department of Education, Council of Chief State School Officers, Connecticut State Department of Education, and local education agencies. We use the Internet to display all forums/conference-related activities. This includes publishing all presentation materials after the conference is held.
Figure 4. Web pages tied to the conference.
This 3rd edition of *Neag School of Education Assessment Plan*, facilitated by the Neag Assessment Committee, was a collaboration among many including the Neag faculty, staff, and students, current and alumni students, employers, clinic faculty, and other schools. The *Neag School of Education Assessment Plan* has incorporated many best practices including embracing the following:

- Focus on facilitating an assessment culture.
- A system of participatory participation in assessment development and reporting by the Neag Assessment Committee and others.
- Formative and summative assessments at both the candidate and program level to embrace ongoing feedback on a continual basis.
- Internal data with efforts made to ensure that assessments are credible, fair, consistent, accurate, and unbiased, allowing for multiangulation.
- Information available from external sources such as state licensing exams, evaluation through clinic experiences, employer reports, and alumni studies.
- Alignment of all accreditation processes from the university to program levels.
- A concerted effort to provide a spotlight on assessment.
- A system for reviewing and approving the assessment plan.
- Assessment-related research opportunities.
Each year, goals and yearly objectives are developed and implemented by the Neag Assessment Committee and its various Subcommittees. The following points represent the groups’ goals and objectives.

In 2011-2012, our major objectives will be to:

- Fine tune and publish the *Neag School of Education Assessment Plan* (3rd edition),
- Complete the development, administration, and reporting of employer surveys,
- Provide on-going feedback for special assessment research,
- Develop and implement assessment guidelines for the school (e.g. website publication, inquiries for studies/information),
- Suggest modifications to the assessment website,
- Solidify school climate survey(s) to be administered in 2012-2013,
- Coordinate the completed Annual Concentration Report for Assessment and the NEASC OATS reporting requirements, and
- Continue to support further coordination of various subcommittees (i.e. all mentioned in the organizational framework).

In 2010-11, our major objectives were to:

- Continue to support further coordination of various subcommittees (i.e., all mentioned in the organizational framework),
- Administer the alumni survey and provide feedback on the initial drafts of the report,
- Administer the employer survey and provide feedback on the initial drafts of the report,
- Begin initial discussion on school climate survey(s) to be administered,
- Review the completed *Annual Concentration Report for Assessment*, and
- Fine tune/Revise *The Neag School of Education Assessment Plan* (2nd edition) incorporating 3 years of survey data and accreditation information gathered in preparation for the publication on the 3rd edition.
In 2009-10, our major objectives were to:

- Transitions to an advisory committee with off-shoot assessment working groups (teacher education, clinic evaluation and surveys using Checkbox, assessment alignment, advisory group on Spotlight on Assessment, OATS, fostering assessment through technology),
- Fine-tune the communication with faculty on assessment system and culture, and
- Formulate all questions for alumni (and employee) survey questions for dissemination.

In 2008-09, our objectives were to:

- Provide final edits, share and communicate with faculty on our final edition of the Neag School of Education Assessment Plan,
- Provide feedback on the employer survey report which will be published to all respective groups,
- Discuss and determine plans for our next alumni survey,
- Provide feedback to the faculty and staff climate survey and work on the final report,
- Provide feedback to finalize the Neag School Profile Report, and
- Ensure that each department developed NEASC Assessment Plans in the fall and reported findings in the spring.

In 2007-08, our objectives were to:

- Provide feedback on the alumni survey report,
- Develop and administer employer surveys,
- Solidify our Neag School of Education Assessment Plan, and
- Ensure that each department’s assessment plans are tied to objectives for 2007-08.
APPENDIX B:

NEAG ASSESSMENT COMMITTEE STRUCTURE

General Charge: The Neag Assessment Committee helps develop, implement, and review the Neag Assessment Plan so that we assure a participatory model across all departments and programs. Outcomes of the process may include the development of instruments and protocols, the implementation of assessment designs, the analysis of data, and feedback on assessment initiatives.

Make-up: About 25 members. Two to three faculty from each of five departments; up to three students from each of five departments; two or three individuals to represent the teacher education program.

Objectives Established—Including 2-3 per subcommittee.

---

**Neag Assessment Committee 2011-2012 Overview**

**Neag Assessment Subcommittee on Teacher Preparation Education**
**General charge:** Provides support and advice related to research/assessment activities related to teacher education. Outcomes of this process may include the development of instruments and protocols, the implementation of designs, the analysis of data, and providing feedback regarding initiatives.

**Make-up:** Approximately 20. This committee is composed of leadership experts (Chair, CLA, and AGP), Prof. 12 district and state representatives, undergraduate and graduate faculty, students, and community members. This is a multi-disciplinary team of educational leaders, practitioners, and researchers working together collaboratively to address issues of measurement, assessment, evaluation, and statistical analysis.

**Priorities:** Educational expansion project and proposal to surveys.

---

**Neag Assessment Subcommittee on Administrator Preparation Education**
**General charge:** Provides support and advice related to research/assessment activities related to administrator education. Outcomes of this process may include the development of instruments and protocols, the analysis of data, and providing feedback regarding initiatives.

**Make-up:** Approximately 20. This committee is composed of all university stakeholders. This is a multi-disciplinary team working together collaboratively to address issues of measurement, assessment, and evaluation.

**Priorities:** Develop, analyze, and report on UCAF survey and evaluation tools.

---

**Neag Assessment Critical Friends Group on Clinic Evaluations and Surveys Using Checkboxes**
**Charge:** Facilitate the knowledge and use of checklists for program surveys and forms.

**Make-up:** Program faculty interested in using Checkboxes.

**Priorities:** Shaping and using.

---

**Neag Assessment Critical Friends Group on Assessment Alignment**
**Charge:** Assist with alignment of assessment to standards, syllabi, etc.

**Make-up:** Invited program representatives.

**Priorities:** Alignment.

---

**Neag Assessment Subcommittee on Assessing Assessment through Technology**
**Charge:** Facilitate the knowledge and use of technology for assessment purposes.

**Make-up:** 2 co-chairs, about 6 members of various levels.

**Priorities:** Key CT for assessment features.
In policy manuals, student manuals, and publications of the Neag School programs (all of which are on the website), potential and current students, and others know that we review their academic and non-academic performance each semester for purposes of determining their continued retention in the program. Students who do not meet our expectations are not retained in the program(s), although we attempt to assist them with finding another graduate program that may be better suit their needs.

These procedures are in concert with the UConn Graduate School's policies regarding students who feel aggrieved or uncertain about whether they have been treated fairly by a faculty or staff member. Students have several routes that can be taken to seek resolution. Because many difficulties can result from misunderstandings, clear communication and informal mediation are believed to be the most effective and the least anxiety-provoking. Usually, the first approach is for the student to request a meeting with the faculty or staff member to state the problem and to attempt a direct solution. If that proves unsatisfactory or should such a meeting seem undesirable given the particular circumstance, there are several options. Sometimes appropriate mediation can be provided by other faculty or staff in the Neag School, at other campus units such as the Women’s Center, at a cultural center, or a religious institution. Alternatively, the student may consult with the Director of the Graduate Program, the Department Head, or the Associate Dean, usually in that order. It is the responsibility of the academic administrator to then gather the facts in the case and seek a mutually acceptable resolution. All faculty and staff in the Neag School report ultimately to the Associate Dean and formal action can be taken at that level, if appropriate. In the event that the initial collection of facts suggests a violation of law or of explicit university policy concerning prejudice or harassment, the administrator will immediately consult with appropriate staff in Human Resources or the Provost’s Office regarding appropriate action.
APPENDIX D:

ANNUAL SELF-EVALUATION REPORT

Note: This form was from NCATE and adopted school-wide. It might be refined, as needed.
NEAG ASSESSMENT COMMITTEE:
SELF-ASSESSMENT OF THE ASSESSMENT PLAN

(Rubric and questions adapted from NCATE)

What position best describes you?

[ ] Faculty/Clinician
[ ] Neag Administrator

[ ] Student
[ ] District/State Representative

Are you on the Neag Assessment Committee or any subgroup associated with this committee?

[ ] Yes
[ ] No

What is the department with which you are most aligned?

[ ] Educational Leadership
[ ] Curriculum and Instruction
[ ] Physical Therapy

[ ] Educational Psychology
[ ] Kinesiology
[ ] None of the above.

Directions for Part A: Using the rubric, please "grade" our current assessment system. Please keep in mind that the assessment system is described in The Neag School of Education Assessment Plan (3rd edition), published in the fall of 2011, and discussed in each department's faculty meeting.

WE HAVE AN ASSESSMENT SYSTEM THAT COLLECTS AND ANALYZES DATA (for example, on applicant qualifications, candidate and graduate performance, Neag School operations).

UNACCEPTABLE
We have not involved our professional community in the development of our assessment system; it is limited to monitor candidate performance, school's operations, and programs; and, it does not reflect professional, state, and institutional standards. Decisions are based on a single or few assessments and have not examined bias in its assessments, nor made an effort to establish fairness, accuracy, and consistency of its assessment procedures and school's operations.

ACCEPTABLE
We have an assessment system that reflects the conceptual framework, and professional and state standards and is regularly evaluated by our professional community; includes a comprehensive integrated assessment and evaluation measures to monitor candidate
performance and manage/improve the school’s operations and programs; and decisions about candidate performance are based on multiple assessments at admission into programs, appropriate transition points, and program completion. We have taken effective steps to eliminate bias in assessments and work to establish the fairness, accuracy, and consistency of its assessment procedures and school’s operations.

**TARGET**

With the involvement of its professional community, we regularly evaluate the capacity and effectiveness of our assessment system, which reflects the conceptual framework and incorporates candidate proficiencies outlined in professional and state standards. We regularly examine the validity and utility of the data and make modifications to keep abreast of changes in technology and in professional standards. Decisions about candidate performance are based on multiple assessments. Data show the strong relationship of performance assessments to candidate success throughout their programs and post-graduation. We conduct thorough studies and make changes to establish fairness, accuracy, and consistency of its assessment procedures and school’s operations.

Rating:

___ Unacceptable  ___ Acceptable  ___ Target

**Strengths:**

**Areas for Improvement:**

**DATA COLLECTION, ANALYSIS, AND EVALUATION**

**UNACCEPTABLE**

We do not regularly and comprehensively gather, aggregate, summarize, and analyze assessment and evaluation information on the school’s operations, its programs, or candidates. We do not maintain a record of formal candidate complaints or document the resolution of complaints. We do not use appropriate information technologies to maintain our assessment system. We do not use multiple assessments from internal and external sources to collect data on applicant qualifications, candidate proficiencies, graduates, school operations, and program quality.
ACCEPTABLE
We maintain an assessment system that provides regular and comprehensive information on applicant qualifications, candidate proficiencies, and competence of graduates, school operations, and program quality. Using multiple assessments from internal and external sources, we collect data from applicants, candidates, recent graduates, faculty, and other members of the professional community. Candidate assessment data are regularly and systematically collected, compiled, aggregated, summarized, and analyzed to improve candidate performance, program quality, and school operations. We maintain records of formal candidate complaints and documentation of their resolution. We maintain our assessment system through the use of information technologies.

TARGET
We provide regular and comprehensive data on program quality, school's operations, and candidate performance at identified points, extending into the first years of completers' practice. Assessment data from candidates, graduates, faculty, and other members of the professional community are based on multiple assessments from both internal and external sources that are systematically collected as candidates' progress through programs. These data are regularly and systematically compiled, aggregated, summarized, analyzed, and reported publicly for the purpose of improving candidate performance, program quality, and school operations. We have a system for effectively maintaining records of formal candidate complaints and their resolutions. We develop and test different information technologies to improve our assessment system.

Rating:

| ____Unacceptable | ____Acceptable | ____Target |

Strengths:

Areas for Improvement:

USE OF DATA FOR PROGRAM IMPROVEMENT

UNACCEPTABLE
We make limited or no use of data collected, including candidate and graduate performance
information, to evaluate the efficacy of its courses, programs, and clinical experiences. We fail to make changes in its courses, programs, and clinical experiences when evaluations indicate that modifications would strengthen candidate preparation to meet professional, state, and institutional standards. No one has access to candidate assessment data and/or data systems. We are not regularly provided formative feedback based upon our assessments.

**ACCEPTABLE**
We regularly and systematically use data, including candidate and graduate performance information, to evaluate the efficacy of its courses, programs, and clinical experiences. We analyze program evaluation and performance assessment data to initiate changes in programs and school operations. We have access to candidate assessment data and/or data systems. Candidate assessment data are regularly shared with us to reflect on and improve performance and programs.

**TARGET**
We have fully developed evaluations and continuously search for stronger relationships in the evaluations, revising both the underlying data systems and analytic techniques as necessary. We not only make changes based on the data, but also systematically study the effects of any changes to assure that programs are strengthened without adverse consequences. We review data on candidate performance regularly and develop plans for improvement based on the data.

Rating:

____ Unacceptable  ____ Acceptable  ____ Target

**Strengths:**

**Areas for Improvement:**

**Part B.** Please answer the following questions by selecting the best option.

We align curriculum, instruction, and assessments with professional, state, and/or institutional standards.

__ We do not do this.
__ We do this minimally.
__ We do this acceptably.
__ We do this extremely well.
We examine the efficacy of courses, field experiences, and programs.

_We do not do this._
_We do this minimally._
_We do this acceptably._
_We do this extremely well._

We assess students on content knowledge, pedagogical and/or professional knowledge and skills, professional dispositions, and their effects as outlined in professional, state, and institutional standards.

_We do not do this._
_We do this minimally._
_We do this acceptably._
_We do this extremely well._

We review our programs and make refinement where needed, over time, to ensure quality.

_We do not do this._
_We do this minimally._
_We do this acceptably._
_We do this extremely well._

Our student assessments and evaluations are purposeful, evolving from missions, the conceptual framework, and/or program goals.

_We do not do this._
_We do this minimally._
_We do this acceptably._
_We do this extremely well._

Our assessments are comprehensive, including measures related to faculty, the curriculum, and instruction, as well as what students know and can do.

_We do not do this._
_We do this minimally._
_We do this acceptably._
_We do this extremely well._

We address fairness, consistency, accuracy, and avoidance of bias in assessments to the degree possible.

_We do not do this._
_We do this minimally._
_We do this acceptably._
_We do this extremely well._
We gather and use assessments from various sources—for example, field experiences, clinical sites, content courses, faculty, candidates, graduates, and employers.

[ ] We do not do this.
[ ] We do this minimally.
[ ] We do this acceptably.
[ ] We do this extremely well.

We use technology in our data gathering and analysis, as well as more broadly in planning and evaluation.

[ ] We do not do this.
[ ] We do this minimally.
[ ] We do this acceptably.
[ ] We do this extremely well.

We use information available from external sources such as state licensing exams, evaluations during an induction or mentoring year, and employer reports.

[ ] We do not do this.
[ ] We do this minimally.
[ ] We do this acceptably.
[ ] We do this extremely well.

In the evaluation of operations and programs, we collect, analyze, and use a broad array of information and data from course evaluations and evaluations of clinical practice, faculty, admissions process, advising system, school partnerships, program quality, Neag School governance, etc.

[ ] We do not do this.
[ ] We do this minimally.
[ ] We do this acceptably.
[ ] We do this extremely well.

Optional: If you are a Neag faculty member, what program are you in? Check all that apply.

- Integrated Bachelor’s/Master’s Program (IB/M)
- Teacher Certification Program for College Graduates (TCPCG)
- Reading/Language Arts
- Adult Learning
- Higher Education—Student Affairs
- UCAPP
- Executive Leadership
Thank you for your honest answers.
ANNUAL CONCENTRATION REPORT

Name of Concentration: __________________________
Concentration Leader: __________________________
Department Leader: __________________________

Please provide the completed electronic copy to your department leader and to Mary Yakimowski, Neag Assessment Office.

1. Indicate the month(s) that the Neag School’s assessment/evaluation system was discussed, as documented in agendas and minutes. This may include, but is not limited to, department, program, teacher education program, and other meetings.

   August 2009 _____ December _____ April _____
   September _____ January 2010 _____ May _____
   October _____ February _____ June _____
   November _____ March _____

2. Indicate your alignment studies of courses completed this year. This may involve course objectives and/or assessments tied to the revised conceptual framework, and professional or state standards. More specifically, indicate which course(s) and briefly describe the findings.

3. Offer a brief summary of this past year’s pertinent results in two of the four areas noted below from in the Neag School of Education Assessment Plan.

   a. Admissions assessment data and interpretation.
   b. Midterm assessment data and interpretation.
   c. Program completion data and interpretations.
   d. Post-graduation data and interpretations.

4. What significant changes will the program make based on data? (Include what data you used and what you are changing in the following chart.) What did you maintain because of data?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data source</th>
<th>What will be changed/maintained?</th>
<th>How will it be changed?</th>
<th>How you will assess change?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Example</td>
<td><em>Data from the interview evaluation form</em> Results indicate there was little (r=.05 to .12) interrater agreement among those on the selection committee.*</td>
<td><em>The program will implement directions and rubrics to enhance the interrater agreement.</em></td>
<td>Next year, we will reassess the interrater correlations as we are hoping for ( r &gt; .80 ).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.                                                                                  |
2.                                                                                  |
3.                                                                                  |
4.                                                                                  |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronym</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACA</td>
<td>American Counseling Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACEI</td>
<td>Association for Early Childhood Education International</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACTFL</td>
<td>American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APA</td>
<td>American Psychological Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASHA</td>
<td>American Speech-Language-Hearing Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BEST</td>
<td>Beginning Educator Support and Training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CoA</td>
<td>Commission on Accreditation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAA</td>
<td>Council on Academic Accreditation in Audiology and Speech-Language Pathology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAAHEP</td>
<td>Commission on Accreditation of Allied Health Educational Programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAATE</td>
<td>Commission on Accreditation of Athletic Trainer Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CACREP</td>
<td>Council for Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAPTE</td>
<td>Commission for Accreditation of Physical Therapy Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAT</td>
<td>Connecticut Administrator Test</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIHE</td>
<td>Commission on Institutions of Higher Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLAS</td>
<td>College of Liberal Arts and Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ETS</td>
<td>Educational Testing Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GPA</td>
<td>Grade Point Average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRE</td>
<td>Graduate Record Examination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRA</td>
<td>International Reading Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JRC-AT</td>
<td>Joint Review Committee on Educational Programs in Athletic Training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAT</td>
<td>Miller Analogies Test</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NASP</td>
<td>National Association of School Psychologists</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCATE</td>
<td>National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCSS</td>
<td>National Council for the Social Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCTE</td>
<td>National Council of Teachers of English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCTM</td>
<td>National Council of Teachers of Mathematics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEASC</td>
<td>New England Association for Schools and Colleges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NPBEA</td>
<td>National Policy Board for Educational Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSTA</td>
<td>National Science Teachers Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OATS</td>
<td>Online Assessment Tracking System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PDS</td>
<td>Professional Development School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPA</td>
<td>Specialized Professional Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCAC</td>
<td>Teaching Certification Assessment Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TNE</td>
<td>Teachers for a New Era</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UCAPP</td>
<td>University of Connecticut Administrator Preparation Program</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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